

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 0:23-cv-61131-LEIBOWITZ/STRAUSS

SARAH ISRAEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

GRAND PEAKS PROPERTY
MANAGEMENT, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

THIS MATTER was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jared M. Strauss for resolution on Defendant’s Motion and Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant’s Bill of Costs (the “Motion”) [ECF No. 77]. [ECF No. 78]. Judge Strauss has since issued a Report and Recommendation (the “R&R”), recommending that the Motion be granted in part and denied in part. [ECF No. 86]. Neither party has submitted objections, and the time to do so has passed. After careful review of the filings, the applicable law, and the record, the Court adopts Judge Strauss’ R&R in its entirety.

“In order to challenge the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge, a party must file written objections which shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which objection is made and the specific basis for objection.” *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App’x 781, 783 (11th Cir. 2006) (cleaned up). The objections must also present “supporting legal authority.” S.D. Fla. L. Mag. J.R. 4(b). Once a district court receives “objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above,” it must “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the findings

or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Macort*, 208 F. App’x at 783–84 (cleaned up). To the extent a party fails to object to parts of the magistrate judge’s report, those portions are reviewed for clear error. *Id.* at 784 (cleaned up).

The parties have not submitted any objections to Judge Strauss’ R&R, and the time to do so has passed. As such, the Court has reviewed the R&R for clear error only. Upon this review, the Court finds not only no clear error but also notes that Judge Strauss’ R&R is thorough, cogent, and compelling. The Court adopts the R&R in its entirety (except for the footnote below).

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:**

1. Magistrate Judge Strauss’ R&R [ECF No. 86] is **AFFIRMED AND ADOPTED**.
2. Defendant’s Motion and Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant’s Bill of Costs [ECF No. 77] is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART**.
3. Defendant is awarded taxable costs in the amount of \$3,468.07.¹

DONE AND ORDERED in the Southern District of Florida this 8th day of January, 2025.


DAVID S. LEIBOWITZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc: Sarah Israel, *pro se*
counsel of record

¹ The Court notes that the R&R stated that Plaintiff should be awarded taxable costs in the amount of \$3,468.07 [ECF No. 86 at 9], but it should have said Defendant.